

Application No. 10/533,705
Paper Dated September 22, 2006
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 22, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 3988-050399

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-6. The first replacement sheet includes Figs. 1 and 2 and replaces the original sheet including Figs. 1 and 2. The second replacement sheet includes Fig. 3 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3. Changes incorporated in this sheet are indicated in red on the attached annotated copy of the original sheet. The third replacement sheet, which includes Figs. 4 and 5, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 4 and 5. The fourth replacement sheet includes Fig. 6 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6.

Attachments: Four Replacement Sheets
Annotated Copies of Original Sheet Containing Fig. 3.

Application No. 10/533,705
Paper Dated September 22, 2006
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 22, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 3988-050399

REMARKS

Claims 13-32 are pending in this application. In this Amendment, claims 13, 14, and 20 are amended. The drawings are also amended. No new subject matter is believed to have been added by these amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has stated that claims 13-32 are directed to allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 13-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the use of the word "it" in claim 13, line 3 is vague and indefinite and that both "the purge setting" and "the sealing rings" in claims 14 and 20, respectively, lack antecedent basis.

Regarding the rejection of claims 13-32, the Applicant believes that the above amendments to the claims overcome the Examiner's indefiniteness rejections.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Drawings Objections

The Examiner objected to the drawings because of poor line quality and the presence of copy marks or smudges. The replacement sheets included herein overcome these objections. Additionally, the Examiner objected to Figure 3 because it contained German words. Figure 3 has been corrected to overcome this objection and this correction is reflected in the corresponding replacement sheet. The amendments to Figure 3 are shown in red in the attached annotated copy of Figure 3.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/533,705
Paper Dated September 22, 2006
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 22, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 3988-050399

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of pending claims 13-32 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By Russell D. Orkin

Russell D. Orkin
Registration No. 25,363
Attorney for Applicants
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com

ANNOTATED SHEET

WO 2004/106785

PCT/EP2004/005886

2/4

